## Scorecards

## **Information Technology**

| <b>7</b> 1         | ア No filter |         | DIT Strategic Objectives                                   |              |         |          |            |                   |  |  |
|--------------------|-------------|---------|--|--------------|---------|----------|------------|-------------------|--|--|
| Proj               | ect M       | lanag   | ement  |              |         |          |            |                   |  |  |
| 8                  | Δ₩          |         | Name   | Actual       | Target  | Variance | Variance % | Time<br>Period    |  |  |
| •                  | -           | -       | # of EPM Total Projects                                    | 51           | 15      | 36       | 240%       | FY 09,<br>Q3, Mar |  |  |
|                    | -           |         | Percent of Projects "Critical"                             | 5.00%        | 0.00%   | 5.00%    |            | FY 09,<br>Q3, Mar |  |  |
| <b>\</b>           | -           | <u></u> | Percent of Projects "At Risk"                              | 2.00%        | 5.00%   | -3.00%   | 60.00%     | FY 09,<br>Q3, Mar |  |  |
|                    | -           | <u></u> | Percent of Projects " On Hold"                             | 13.00%       | 10.00%  | 3.00%    | 30.00%     | FY 09,<br>Q3, Mar |  |  |
| <b>\rightarrow</b> | -           |         | Percent of Projects - " On Track"                          | 80.00%       | 85.00%  | -5.00%   | 5.88%      | FY 09,<br>Q3, Mar |  |  |
| <b>\rightarrow</b> | -           |         | % of Projects managed by DIT PMO PM's                      | 65.00%       | 80.00%  | -15.00%  | 18.75%     | FY 09,<br>Q3, Mar |  |  |
| •                  | ▼           |         | Average # of projects managed by DIT PMO PM                | 6            | 3       | 2        | 83%        | FY 09,<br>Q3, Mar |  |  |
|                    | -           |         | % of Projects managed by "other" DIT or citywide resources | 35.00%       | 20.00%  | 15.00%   | 75.00%     | FY 09,<br>Q3, Mar |  |  |
| Mair               | ntain       | Relia   | ble Infrastructure (40%)                                   |              |         |          |            |                   |  |  |
| 8                  | ΔΨ          |         | Name   | Actual       | Target  | Variance | Variance % | Time<br>Period    |  |  |
| <b>\</b>           | <b>A</b>    |         | Mainframe Application Availability                         | 99.98%       | 100.00% | -0.02%   | 0.02%      | FY 09,<br>Q3, Mar |  |  |
| <b>\</b>           | -           |         | Mainframe Network Availability                             | 99.75%       | 100.00% | -0.25%   | 0.25%      | FY 09,<br>Q3, Mar |  |  |
| •                  | ₩           |         | Percent Systems Availability                               | 98.60%       | 100.00% | -1.40%   | 1.40%      | FY 09,<br>Q3, Mar |  |  |
| •                  | ₩           |         | Percent Critical Applications Availability                 | 98.50%       | 100.00% | -1.50%   | 1.50%      | FY 09,<br>Q3, Mar |  |  |
| •                  | -           |         | # of successful attempts ( Internal)                       | 0            | 0       | 0        |            | FY 09,<br>Q3, Mar |  |  |
| •                  | -           | -       | External Protection Effectiveness                          | 100.00%      | 100.00% | 0.00%    | 0.00%      | FY 09,<br>Q3, Mar |  |  |
| ß                  |             |         | # of External Security Incidents                           | 2,072,087.00 |         |          |            | FY 09, Q3         |  |  |
| B                  |             |         | Average # of Security Incidents per pc                     | 200          |         |          |            | FY 09,<br>Q3, Mar |  |  |
|                    |             |         | Quality Customer Service (40%)                             |              |         |          |            |                   |  |  |
| 8                  | ΔΨ          |         | Name   | Actual       | Target  | Variance | Variance % | Time<br>Period    |  |  |
| ß                  |             |         | Total Customer Service Requests -<br>Created               | 5,508        |         |          |            | FY 09, Q3         |  |  |
|                    | ▼           |         | Total Customer Service Requests -Open                      | 867          | 525     | 342      | 65%        | FY 09, Q2         |  |  |
|                    | Δ           |         | Average # of days ticket is open                           | 37           | 30      | 7        | 23%        | FY 09, Q3         |  |  |

Metric Studio

## Scorecards

## **Information Technology**

| 7                  | 7 No filter |         | DIT Strategic Objectives  |                  |                  |                |               |                   |  |  |
|--------------------|-------------|---------|---|------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------|-------------------|--|--|
| 8                  | ΔΨ          |         | Name  | Actual           | Target           | Variance       | Variance<br>% | Time<br>Period    |  |  |
| <b>\rightarrow</b> |             |         | Total Customer Service Requests -<br>Resolved                                 | 6,338            | 6,300            | 38             | 1%            | FY 09, Q1         |  |  |
| •                  | 4           |         | Average # of days to resolve (overall)  | 11               | 15               | -4             | 27%           | FY 09, Q3         |  |  |
|                    | -           |         | Percent of Customers Contacted (CC) within 24 hours                           | 91.0%            | 90.0%            | 1.0%           | 1.1%          | FY 09,<br>Q3, Mar |  |  |
| <b>&gt;</b>        | <b>A</b>    | <u></u> | Percent of Total Customer Service<br>Request Resolved - across all priorities | 84.0%            | 85.0%            | -1.0%          | 1.2%          | FY 09,<br>Q3, Mar |  |  |
| <b>&gt;</b>        | <b>A</b>    |         | Percent of Customer Requests Resolved -<br>Urgent                             | 50.0%            | 85.0%            | -35.0%         | 41.2%         | FY 09,<br>Q3, Mar |  |  |
|                    | ₩           |         | Percent of Customer Service Request<br>Resolved - High                        | 88.0%            | 85.0%            | 3.0%           | 3.5%          | FY 09,<br>Q3, Mar |  |  |
| <b>&gt;</b>        | -           |         | Percent of Customer Request Resolved -<br>Medium                              | 82.0%            | 85.0%            | -3.0%          | 3.5%          | FY 09,<br>Q3, Mar |  |  |
| <b>&gt;</b>        | <b>A</b>    |         | Percent of Customer Service Requests<br>Resolved - Low                        | 85.0%            | 85.0%            | 0.0%           | 0.0%          | FY 09,<br>Q3, Mar |  |  |
| Man                | nage t      | he Bu   | usiness (20%)   |                  |                  |                |               |                   |  |  |
| 8                  | Δ₩          |         | Name  | Actual           | Target           | Variance       | Variance %    | Time<br>Period    |  |  |
|                    | ▼           |         | Percent of Budget Expended  | 80.70%           | 75.00%           | 5.70%          | 7.60%         | FY 09, Q3         |  |  |
|                    | ₩           |         | DIT Budget Expended   | 2,154,437,550.0% | 2,001,653,327.0% | 152,784,223.0% | 7.6%          | FY 09, Q3         |  |  |